DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 297 UD 029 327

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.
TITLE Response to the Annual Desegregation Review, 1990-91. Part I: Student Assignment Component.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 39p.; For related documents, see UD 029 328-331.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Advisory Committees; Affirmative Action; Black Youth; *Desegregation Plans; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Guidelines; Magnet Schools; *Program Implementation; Public Schools; Racial Composition; Racial Integration; Racially Balanced Schools; *School Desegregation; *Student Placement; Transfer Students; *Urban Schools; *Voluntary Desegregation; Whites
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation in the Chicago (Illinois) Public Schools formally responded to the 1990-91 Chicago Board of Education's Desegregation Review on Student Assignment. That Board report presented data on the contribution of various student assignment procedures to the voluntary desegregation of the schools. In addition, the report commented on strategies for relieving overcrowded schools, desegregation transfer program, magnet schools, mandatory backup measures, analysis of fiscal resources, interdistrict transfers, and the prevention of within-school desegregation. Analysis of this report by the Monitoring Commission notes the following concerns: (1) 11 of the 126 schools classified as integrated/desegregated are not meeting their racial balance criteria; (2) controlled enrollment may become an inadvertent vehicle for segregation or need more desirable enrollment sites for racial/ethnic minorities; (3) financial aspects of the report are difficult to evaluate because funding from all sources for individual schools is not provided; (4) permission for students to enroll in their attendance area schools once the school is at design capacity is supported; (5) the Commission supports mandatory measures to ensure compliance with the minimum 30 percent minority enrollment; and (6) the Commission does not endorse a recommendation that students from feeder schools should be given priority in the voluntary transfer process as it would undermine the lottery. Includes 12 tables. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359297

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

Response to the

ANNUAL DESEGREGATION REVIEW, 1990-91 PART I: STUDENT ASSIGNMENT COMPONENT

Under the Student Desegregation Plan
for the Chicago Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
...NAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X ...

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Jones.
Mon. Commiss. Desegr. Implementation
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

November 1992

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Henry H. Martinez
Chairperson

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation monitors The Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools

ED359297

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Henry H. Martinez, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate
Mari C. Fohrman
Carlos Heredia
Gwendolyn Laroche
Uthman Muhammad
George E. Riddick
Aida Sanchez-Romano

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION CONSULTANTS

Norman R. Kurtz

Calvin M. Smith, Jr.

COMMISSION STAFF

Ana Tapia, Project Director

Alice H. Blackburn, Field Monitor

Camille Poindexter, Student Office Assistant

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
4th Floor, Center Building, Northwest
Chicago, Illinois 60609
(312) 535-8220
FAX (312) 535-4218

MONITORING COMMISSION
FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

RESPONSE TO THE

ANNUAL DESEGREGATION REVIEW, 1990-91
PART I: STUDENT ASSIGNMENT COMPONENT

Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Calvin M. Smith, Jr., Primary Consultant

November 1992

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND 1

LIST OF TABLES ii

AN EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT iii

II. PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION RESPONSE 1

III. THE CONTENT OF THE ADR 1

IV. COMMISSION ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL SYSTEM PROGRESS 2

- A. Summary of Progress 2
- B. Degree of Student Participation in the Options for Knowledge Program 3
- C. The Use of School Facilities and the Issue of Overcrowding 16
- D. Participation of Unique Student Groups in Options for Knowledge Schools 22
- E. The Effects of the Plan on the Chicago Public Schools 24
- F. Mandatory Backup Measures, Interdistrict Transfers and Within-School Segregation 25
- G. Financial Aspects of Implementing the Plan 25
- H. Recommended Implementation Strategies 27

V. CONCLUSION 31

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 -	Student by Race/Ethnicity Under the Plan and and in Integrated/Desegregated Schools 1990-91 ADR	5
Table 2 -	Students by Race/Ethnicity Under the Plan in Racially Identifiable Schools 1990-91 ADR	7
Table 3 -	Students by Race/Ethnicity in Stable Desegregated Schools 1990-91 ADR	8
Table 4 -	Stably Desegregated Schools in Non-Compliance Student Enrollments (Requirement: at Least 35 Percent Minority) 1990-91 ADR	9
Table 5 -	Students by Race/Ethnicity in Magnet Schools 1990-91 ADR	11
Table 6 -	Magnet Schools in Non-Compliance White and Minority Student Enrollments (Requirement: 15-35 Percent White/65-85 Percent Minority), 1990-91	12
Table 7 -	Integrated/Desegregated Schools Revised White and Minority Student Enrollments, 1990-91 ADR	15
Table 8 -	Actual Number of Students by Race/Ethnicity Under the Plan and in Integrated/Desegregated Schools 1990-91 ADR	16
Table 9 -	Race/Ethnicity of Entering Students Affected by Controlled Enrollment 1990-91	19
Table 10 -	Race/Ethnicity of all Students Affected by Controlled Enrollment 1990-91	20
Table 11 -	Location of Controlled Enrollments Type of School 1990-91	21
Table 12 -	Expenditures by Category of School 1988-90	26

November 1992

AN EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
Monitoring Response:

Annual Desegregation Review, 1990-1991 Part I

under the Student Desegregation Plan
for the Chicago Public Schools

This is the Monitoring Commission's formal response to the Chicago Board of Education's 1990-91 Annual Desegregation Review Part I: Student Assignment Component (1990-91 ADR Part I). The Consent Decree reached between the Board of Education and the United States Department of Justice in 1980 requires that the ADR Part I be published annually.

Background

The Board uses this document (ADR Part I) and other ADRs to review and evaluate its progress toward improving the education of students in the Chicago Public Schools.

Report Findings

The Chicago Board of Education's Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs (DEEOP) presented data on the contribution of various student assignment procedures to the voluntary desegregation of Chicago Public Schools. The presentation is organized around various categories of schools established by the Plan. In addition, the report comments on strategies for relieving overcrowded schools, desegregation transfer programs, magnet schools, mandatory backup measures, analysis of fiscal resources, interdistrict transfers, and the prevention of within school desegregation.

Monitoring Commission's Analysis

The Monitoring Commission analyzed the 1990-91 ADR Part I and noted the following concerns:

- Eleven of the 126 schools currently classified as integrated/desegregated are not meeting their racial balance criteria including five of 65 stably desegregated schools, five of 30 magnet schools, and one of five scholastic academies.

- If the students in the 11 schools are counted as outside the parameters of integrated/desegregated schools the percent of students under the Plan in such schools declines from 21.8 to 19.6 percent.

- The Commission expresses concern that controlled enrollment may become an inadvertent vehicle for segregation or reduce more desirable enrollment sites for racial/ethnic minorities.

- Financial aspects of the Plan are difficult to evaluate because funding from all sources for individual schools is not provided.

- Permission for students to enroll in their attendance area schools once the school is at design capacity is supported, but with flexibility around family needs.

- The Commission concurs that improperly enrolled students should be returned to their attendance areas.

- The Commission supports mandatory measures to ensure compliance with the minimum 30 percent minority enrollment.

- The Commission endorses changing Metcalfe from a magnet school to a community academy.

- The Commission does not endorse the recommendation that students from feeder schools should be given priority in the voluntary transfer process. It would undermine the intent of the lottery.

- The Commission agrees with the proposal to establish George Gershwin School as a Mathematics and Science Community Academy.

This response of the Monitoring Commission to the 1990-91 ADR Part I was completed under the direction of Dr. Mary E. Davidson, principal investigator and primary consultants, Drs. Calvin M. Smith and Norman R. Kurtz. Copies are available for reference at the Monitoring Commission office, 1819 West Pershing Road, 4th Floor, Center Building, Northwest, Chicago, Illinois 60609.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Resolution 91-0522-RS1 the Chicago Board of Education (Board) has adopted and approved the 1990-91 Annual Desegregation Review Part I: Student Assignment Component (1990-91 ADR Part I). The Board is required by the January 1982, Comprehensive Student Assignment Plan (Plan) to annually assess progress being made toward the achievement of the objectives and requirements of the Plan.

II. PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION RESPONSE

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation (Commission) was established by the Board-adopted Recommendations on Educational Components to monitor the effectiveness with which various stages of the desegregation of the Chicago Public Schools are carried out. As such, the Commission has a legal mandate to provide the Chicago community with an independent assessment of the Board's stated progress toward attaining desegregation goals and objectives.

III. THE CONTENT OF THE ADR

The 1990-91 ADR Part I is comprised of two major narrative sections and six appendices. The first major section, overview of Student Assignment Component, contains the Board's stated progress on how various student assignment processes and procedures contribute to the voluntary desegregation of the Chicago Public Schools. Commentary is provided with regard to the actual levels of desegregation being achieved in the various categories of schools established by the Plan including schools that remain racially identifiable. In addition, the Board comments on strategies to relieve overcrowded schools,

the desegregation transfer program, magnet programs within schools, mandatory backup measures, analysis of fiscal resources, interdistrict transfers and the prevention of within school segregation. The second section of 1990-91 ADR Part I, Implementations Strategies, discusses the various changes in procedure that the Board has endorsed for the succeeding school year.

IV. COMMISSION ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL SYSTEM PROGRESS

The Chicago Public Schools have published ADRs since 1982-83. Prior to the 1989-90 ADR Part I the Commission always responded to the content of an ADR in a point-by-point fashion. However, with the publishing of 1989-90 ADR Part I, the Commission decided that this type of response was no longer necessary. The Commission concluded that because the Chicago Public Schools were functionally desegregated with regard to student assignment, it would be more prudent to address the remaining substantive issues in the area of student assignment by properly framing the issues and responding to them.

A. Summary of Progress

The Plan requires that the Board "establish the greatest number of stably desegregated schools," by initiating three overall strategies:[1]

- Stabilize and increase the level of integration already existing in some schools;
- Desegregate, to the greatest practicable extent, schools that are not desegregated; and,

---

[1] Annual Desegregation Review, 1990-91 Part I: Student Assignment Component, Under the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools, Spring 1991, p. i.

- Focus on methods, primarily through magnet schools and magnet programs, which will attract children of all races and ethnic groups to particular schools without compulsory measures.

In addition, the Board is to achieve and maintain a desegregation index of 2.0 with regard to the student enrollment in integrated/desegregated schools. The desegregation index is a ratio of the total number of students enrolled in integrated/desegregated schools to the number of white students so enrolled.

In 1990, it was reported that 78,509 students were enrolled in 126 integrated/desegregated schools of which 29,311 were white. Thus, the ratio for 1990 was 78,509 divided by 29,311 which equals 2.68, well above the required minimum.[2] While the aggregate numbers result in a positive desegregation index, analysis of success in individual schools, which follows below, results in a less positive assessment.

B. Degree of Student Participation in the Options for Knowledge Programs

The principle mechanism used by the Chicago Public Schools for desegregating schools is the Options for Knowledge Programs. These programs are designed to motivate families to seek voluntary transfers to schools where such transfers will enhance racial balance. In addition, in many schools, the school system has created high-profile educational programs known as full-site magnets or specialty programs. The Options for Knowledge Programs are school wide which means that every student in the school

---

[2] Ibid., p. 31.

participates in the program. The latter are smaller in scope and involve a limited number of students in each school.

An important component of the Options for Knowledge Programs is the voluntary transfer program which permits students to transfer to conventional schools if such a transfer will enhance the existing racial balance. Program enticements are not always a part of this process.

The purpose of the voluntary transfer program is to allow families to participate voluntarily in desegregation as opposed to being mandatorily assigned to a school to enhance racial balance. The program must be seen in the context of a school system that has an ever-declining white student enrollment[3] and an ever-increasing minority enrollment, made up primarily of Hispanic students.[4] The declining white student population has made task of enhancing racial balance increasingly more arduous.

The ADR reports that a total of 360,466 Chicago Public Schools students are covered by the Plan. Table 1, on the following page, shows the number and percent of students from each of the racial/ethnic groups under the Plan. It also shows the number and percent of students from each racial/ethnic group under the Plan who are enrolled in integrated/desegregated schools.

The Plan includes 42,631 white students who make up only 11.8 percent of students under the Plan; 29,311 or 68.75 percent of them are enrolled in integrated/desegregated schools.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 19.In 1970 white enrollment was 199,669, in 1980 it was 85,292 and by 1990 it had declined to 48,367.

[4] Ibid., pp. 20-21. While black student members declined from 316,711 in 1970 to 236,914 in 1990, Hispanic students increased from 56,374 in 1970 to 110,707 in 1990.

There are 208,039 black students under the Plan, which is 57.7 percent of all students covered by the Plan, but only 20,754, which is 10 percent of them, attended integrated/-

TABLE 1

Students by Race/Ethnicity Under the Plan and in Integrated/Desegregated Schools
1990-1991 ADR

Race/Ethnicity	Under the Plan		In Integrated/Desegregated	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	42,631	11.8	29,311	68.75
Black	208,039	57.7	20,754	10.0
Hispanic	98,268	27.3	21,947	22.3
Asian	10,850	3.0	6,087	56.1
Amer Indian	658	0.2	410	62.3
Total	360,446	100.0	78,509	n/a

desegregate schools. The 98,268 Hispanic students represent 27.3 percent of the students in the Plan, and 22.3 percent of those in integrated/desegregated schools. There are 10,850 Asian students under the Plan, or 3.0 percent of the total, but more than half of them, 56.1 percent are enrolled in integrated/desegregated schools. The remainder are 658 American Indian students, or 0.2 percent of which 410 or 62.3 percent are in integrated/desegregated schools.

Thus, though the Chicago Public Schools report that they have met and are maintaining the goal of a desegregation index of 2.0 or more and are maintaining 126 stably integrated/desegregated schools, based on Table 1 above it can be said that: 90.0 percent

of the black students, and 77.7 percent of the Hispanic students covered by the requirements of the Plan are still enrolled in either predominantly minority or racially identifiable schools. This is true for only 20.4 percent of the white students.[5] The analysis reported below will show that even these numbers may present an overly optimistic picture.

The 1990-91 ADR Part I reports that there are 126 integrated/desegregated schools in the Chicago Public School system in 1990 down from 135 in 1989-90. The 126 schools enrolled 78,509 students which is a decline from 85,504 students in 1989-90. The decline is primarily due to the fact that nine schools that were classified as integrated/desegregated in 1989-90 were no longer in that category in 1990-91.[6]

In spite of nearly 10 years of implementation, the proportion of black students participating in integrated/desegregated schools in 1990-91 remains below those of white students and is also lower than that of Hispanic students. The obvious conclusion is that black students are less likely to participate in integrated/desegregated schools.

Further, the Commission's analysis shows that black students are much more likely to attend racially identifiable schools. A racially identifiable school is one with a minority enrollment greater than 85 percent. Table 2, on the following page, shows that as many as 178,166 or 85.6 percent of the 208,039 black students under the 1990-91 Plan attended a racially identifiable school even though they make up only 57.7 percent of the students under the Plan. The table also shows that while white students make up 11.8 of those under the Plan, only 10 percent of them are in racially identifiable schools. The percent of

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., pp. 32-33.

TABLE 2

Students by Race/Ethnicity Under the Plan in Racially Identifiable Schools 1990-1991 ADR

Race/Ethnicity	Students Under The Plan		In Racially Identifiable Schools	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	42,631	11.8	4,270	10.0
Black	208,039	57.7	178,166	85.6
Hispanic	98,268	27.3	57,305	58.3
Asian	10,850	3.0	2,084	19.2
Amer Indian	658	0.2	132	20.1
Total	360,466	100.0	241,957	n/a

Hispanic students in racially identifiable schools is 58.3 percent and they constitute 23.7 percent of that population.[7] Again, the evidence shows that not only are black students much less likely to be enrolled in integrated/desegregated schools, but they are much more likely to be enrolled in racially identifiable schools.

A category of integrated/desegregated schools of historic interest to the Commission are the stably desegregated schools which are identified as "to be desegregated" in the Plan. They are schools with disproportionately large white enrollments that were to be desegregated to the point where their enrollments fell within a racial range of no less than

[7] Ibid., p. 33.

30 percent white and 35 percent minority by October 1983.[8] In 1990-91, 65 schools were classified as stably desegregated schools. They enrolled 35,610 students, which is 45.4 percent of the 78,509 students in integrated/desegregated schools in 1990-91. However, students from the different racial/ethnic groups in integrated/desegregated schools are not equally likely to participate in stably desegregated schools. Table 3 shows that 58.1 percent of all white students in integrated/desegregated schools are enrolled in stably desegregated

TABLE 3

Students by Race/Ethnicity
in Stably Desegregated Schools
1990-1991 ADR

Race/Ethnicity	Number in Stably Desegregated Schools	Number in Integrated/ Desegregated Schools	Percent of Integrated/ Desegregated Group Enrolled in Stably Desegregated Schools
White	17,032	29,311	58.1
Black	6,830	20,754	32.9
Hispanic	9,088	21,947	41.4
Asian	2,527	6,087	41.5
Amer Indian	133	410	32.4
Total	35,610	78,509	45.4

schools. But, only 32.9 percent of the black students in integrated/desegregated schools are in the 65 stably desegregated schools. The remaining racial/ethnic groups in the 65 schools

[8] Ibid., p. 51.

are: 41.4 percent of Hispanic students; 41.5 percent of Asian students; and, 32.4 percent of American Indians.[9] Again, black students are least likely to benefit from desegregation.

The foregoing analysis presumes that all of the 65 stably desegregated schools are achieving the stipulated racial balance goals, but that is not the case. The 1990-91 ADR Part I reveals that five schools including Bridge, Cassell, Farnsworth, Hale and Smyser

TABLE 4

Stably Desegregated Schools in Non-Compliance
Student Enrollments
(Requirement: at Least 35 Percent Minority)
1990-1991 ADR

Race/ Ethnicity	School					Total
	Bridge	Cassell	Farnsworth	Hale	Smyser	
White Number Percent	294 (71.4)	125 (65.8)	272 (74.5)	306 (68.9)	278 (69.5)	1275 (70.4)
Black Number Percent	70 (17.0)	40 (21.1)	42 (11.4)	52 (11.7)	43 (10.8)	247 (13.6)
Hispanic Number Percent	31 (7.5)	11 (5.8)	35 (9.6)	61 (13.7)	59 (14.8)	197 (10.9)
Asian Number Percent	15 (3.6)	4 (2.1)	13 (3.6)	25 (5.6)	20 (5.0)	77 (4.3)
Amer Ind Number Percent	2 (0.5)	10 (5.3)	3 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	15 (0.8)
Totals Number Percent	412 (100.0)	190 (100.0)	365 (100.0)	444 (100.0)	400 (100.0)	1811 (100.0)

[9] Ibid., pp. 32-33.

enrolled less than 35 percent minority in 1990-91, see Table 4. A sixth school, Garvy, is exactly on the cusp with 65.0 percent white.[10] The five schools enrolled 1,811 students in 1990-91, of whom 70.4 percent are white, and 29.6 percent are minority. The 29.6 percent minority group students includes 13.6 blacks, 10.9 percent Hispanics, 4.3 percent Asians and 0.8 Native Americans. None of the six schools are in compliance with the racial balance criteria of the Plan and cannot be considered to be stably desegregated.

Full-site magnet schools also have been of concern to the Commission. In the 1990-91 ADR Part I it is reported that there are 30 magnet schools including Black Branch.[11] In 1990-91, the magnet schools enrolled 18,744 students which is 23.9 percent of all students in integrated/desegregated schools, see Table 5 on the following page. The 18,744 students in the magnet schools included 79.7 percent minority students and 20.3 percent were white. As such magnet schools enrolled a larger proportion of minority students than any other category of integrated/desegregated schools.[12]

Table 5 shows that only 13 percent of the white students in integrated/desegregated schools were enrolled in magnet schools. But, a high proportion of black students in integrated/desegregated schools, 43.3 percent were enrolled in magnet schools. They also enrolled 22 percent of Hispanics under the Plan, 16.7 percent of the Asian students, and 26.3 percent of the Native American students under the Plan.

---

[10] Ibid., pp. 55-56.

[11] Ibid., p. 69.

[12] Ibid., p. 33.

The ADR indicates that some magnet schools are not achieving the racial balance and because they are counted as part of the integrated/desegregated schools, they artificially

TABLE 5

Students by Race/Ethnicity
in Magnet Schools
1990-1991 ADR

Race/Ethnicity	Number in Magnet Schools	Number in Integrated/ Desegregated Schools	Percent of Integrated/ Desegregated Group Enrolled in Magnet Schools
White	3,798	29,311	13.0
Black	8,988	20,754	43.3
Hispanic	4,833	21,947	22.0
Asian	1,017	6,087	16.7
Amer Indian	108	410	26.3
Total	18,744	78,509	23.9

inflate the proportion of minority students attending those schools. Magnet schools are required to maintain ranges of 15-35 percent white and 65-85 percent minority students. But, as shown in Table 6, on the following page, at least five of the 30 magnet schools are not complying with the required ranges including: Black Branch with only 11.5 percent white students, Kanoon with 12.8 percent whites, Metcalfe with 7.2 percent whites, Saucedo with 10.3 and Whitney Young with 11.8. In addition, two other schools are on the margins

of non-compliance: Goodlow and Pershing, each of which have 15.0 percent white students.[13]

Table 6 shows the enrollment of students from various racial and minority groups in these five magnet schools that are not in compliance. These five schools enrolled

TABLE 6

Magnet Schools in Non-Compliance
White and Minority Student Enrollments
(Requirement: 15-35 Percent White/65-85 Percent Minority)
1990-1991

Race/ Ethnicity	School					Total
	Black Branch	Kanoon	Metcalfe	Saucedo	Whitney Young	
White						
Number	19	101	66	134	243	563
Percent	(11.5)	(12.8)	(7.2)	(10.3)	(11.8)	(10.8)
Black						
Number	125	98	780	79	1387	2469
Percent	(75.3)	(12.4)	(84.8)	(6.3)	(67.2)	(47.1)
Hispanic						
Number	17	575	70	1087	272	2021
Percent	(10.2)	(73.0)	(7.6)	(83.5)	(13.2)	(38.6)
Asian						
Number	2	13	1	1	157	174
Percent	(1.2)	(1.7)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(7.6)	(3.3)
Amer Ind						
Number	3	1	3	1	4	12
Percent	(1.8)	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.2)
Totals						
Number	166	788	920	1302	2063	5239
Percent	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)

[13] Ibid., pp. 67 and 69.

5,239 students during 1990-91 of which only 10.8 percent were white and the remaining 89.2 percent were minority. Black students made up 47.1 percent, Hispanics were 38.6 percent, Asians were 3.3 percent and the remaining 0.2 percent were American Indians.

The Commission does not doubt the viability of the educational programs in any of these five magnet schools. The Commission is also aware of the difficulties Kanoon and Metcalfe have in meeting the requirement because, as Capital Development Board magnets, they are required to enroll students residing in the local school area. But, the fact remains that these five magnet schools are not enrolling the required ranges of white and minority students and therefore they are not racially integrated/desegregated. In the case of Saucedo, it appears as if enrollment has been mismanaged by allowing too many Hispanic students to enrolled. They make up 83.5 percent of the students in Saucedo.[14] One of the schools, Metcalfe, is being recommended as a Community Academy for these 1991-92 school year while Kanoon and Whitney Young may follow in 1992-93. The Commission concludes that these five 1990-91 magnet schools were racially identifiable and neither they nor their students should not be counted as part of the segregated/desegregated group.

In addition, five schools in the integrated/desegregated group classified as scholastic academies ". . . are to achieve and maintain a racial/ethnic composition of 15-35 percent white and 65-85 percent minority."[15] In 1990-91, Thorp Scholastic Academy enrolled 257 white students making up 35.7 percent of the student body and 462 minority students or 64.3 percent minority. The minority students included 269 blacks, 107 Hispanics, 79 Asians and

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., pp. 76-77.

seven American Indians.[16] As such, Thorp is not meeting the racial balance criteria for scholastic academies.[17]

In summary, the Commission concludes that 11 of the 126 schools, currently classified as integrated/desegregated, are not meeting their required racial balance criteria. They include five of the 65 stably desegregated schools, five of the 30 magnet schools, and one of the five scholastic academies. The Commission further concludes that given the lack of compliance by the 11 schools only 115 rather than 126 schools meet the racial balance criteria established in the Plan for integrated/desegregated schools.

The non-compliance of the 11 schools also changes the number of students attending integrated/desegregated schools. As many as 5,674 students who are currently counted as attending integrated/desegregated schools are, in fact, attending schools not meeting the requirements of the Plan. In the case of stably desegregated schools non-compliance is due to insufficient enrollments of minority students in these five schools. The same is true for Thorp Scholastic Academy. However, in the case of these five magnet schools, non-compliance is due to the over-enrollment of minority students.

Table 7, on the following page, presents the reductions in number of students for each category of integrated/desegregated schools. The totals show that the reported number of students enrolled in schools meeting the Plan requirements, 78,509 should be reduced by

---

[16] Ibid., p. 77.

[17] Ibid., p. 77. Note that DEEOP table on top of the page shows that 35.7 percent of the students in Thorp are white, but the text states it to be 37.4 percent. The numbers in the table indicate that the correct percentage is 35.7.

the 5,674 in schools that do not meet Plan requirements for integrated/desegregated schools. The revised total, properly reflects enrollment, is 72,835.

The changes also affect the number of students from various racial/ethnic categories attending integrated/desegregated schools and suggest that the data in Table 1, at the outset

TABLE 7

Integrated/Desegregated Schools
Revised White and Minority Student Enrollments
1990-1991 ADR

Category	Number Reported in ADR	Number Added to Schools not Meeting Plan Requirements	Actual Number in Schools Meeting Plan Requirements
Stably Integrated	16,658	no change	16,658
Stably Desegregated	35,610	536	35,074
Magnet	18,744	4,676	14,068
Scholastic Academies	2,913	462	2,451
Metropolitan High Schools	4,584	no change	4,584
Total	78,509	5,674	72,835

of this report, should be corrected. Table 8, on the following page, offers those corrections. The number of white students integrated/desegregated schools should be reduced by 1,275 in these five stably desegregated schools, 563 in magnet schools, and 257 in Thorp Scholastic Academy, for a total of 2,095 students. There are actually 27,216 rather than the reported 29,311. And, the percent of white students under the Plan in those schools is 63.8 rather

than the reported 79.6. Similarly, black students should be reduced from 20,754 to 17,769 and only 8.5 percent rather than 10 percent of black students under the Plan are in integrated/desegregated schools. For Hispanics the change is from 21,947 to 19,622 with 20.0 percent in integrated/desegregated schools rather than the reported 27.3 percent. The changes are less significant numerically for Asian and American Indian students. The overall effect of the reduction is from 78,509 to 70,740 changing the percent of all students under the Plan in integrated/desegregated schools from 21.8 percent to 19.6 percent.

TABLE 8

Actual Number of Students by Race/Ethnicity Under the Plan and in Integrated/Desegregated Schools 1990-1991 ADR

Race/Ethnicity	Under the Plan		Reported Integrated/ Desegregated		Actual Integrated/ Desegregated	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	42,631	11.8	29,311	79.6	27,216	63.8
Black	208,039	57.7	20,754	10.0	17,769	8.5
Hispanic	98,268	27.3	21,947	22.3	19,622	20.0
Asian	10,850	3.0	6,087	56.1	5,757	53.1
Amer Indian	658	.2	410	62.3	376	57.1
Total	360,446	100.0	78,509	21.8	70,740	19.6

C. The Use of School Facilities and the Issue of Overcrowding

The Space Utilization Report, compiled by the Department of Facilities, in the 1990-91 ADR Part I provides a great deal of information regarding the nature of overcrowding

in the Chicago Public Schools.[18] It broadens the perspective of the Commission with regard to both the extent of overcrowding and the nature of short and long-term solutions. The Commission has carefully read the "Recommendations" section of this report as well as, "the criteria for the selection of remedies. . ."

The Report states: "Seventy-five schools are severely overcrowded, 93 meet the criteria for being overcrowded, and 77 are operating at less than 50 percent of their design capacity."[19] The Commission notes that the 75 severely overcrowded schools exceed their design capacity by 17,353 students. The 93 overcrowded schools present a different problem in that in 1990-91 they had enrollments of only 67,232 students and a design capacity for 77,130 students. Overcrowding in these schools is due to a shortage of 738 classrooms for special programs, and growth of kindergarten and preschool programs. In terms of regular classrooms, they actually could accommodate more students.[20]

In summary, the severely overcrowded schools enroll 70,483 students, who are educated under the handicapping conditions of inadequate space. The overcrowded schools are handicapped by a shortage of 738 classrooms for specific educational groups. The Commission suspects many, if not a clear majority, of the students in severely overcrowded and overcrowded schools are minority.

The Commission has reviewed all recommendations made by the Department of Facilities and is aware that the resolution of the problem may be long-term and costly. But,

---

[18] See Appendix 5.

[19] Space Utilization Report. Department of Facilities, Appendix 5, p. 3 of the unnumbered document.

[20] Ibid., pp. 7-8 of the unnumbered document.

the cost must be born. The Commission cautions that the standards set forth in the Plan for creating new school space must be adhered to, as the process of relieving overcrowding goes forward.

The Plan states that the Chicago Board of Education will "seek to eliminate overcrowded schools. . ."[21] *To this end, where possible, school boundaries have been* changed, space has been rented or leased when and where available, sites have been purchased, newly constructed schools have been occupied, and use has been made of controlled enrollment.

Controlled enrollment is of interest to the Commission because its implementation the number of students requesting transfers under the auspices of the Options for Knowledge Programs and, seemingly bears on the number of seats available in certain schools for black students requesting transfers. Controlled enrollment is implemented in one of two ways: "by establishing targets for racial composition in schools. . ." and by limiting enrollment consistent with those targets making exceptions for siblings of enrolled students, bilingual students or those with special education needs.[22] Controlled enrollment does not permit new students to enroll in what would otherwise be their neighborhood schools if such enrollment results in exceeding racial enrollment limits. Instead, an alternative school is designated for them. If that school is not acceptable, then like all other

---

[21] 1990-91 ADR Part I, p. 145.

[22] Ibid., p. 147.

Chicago Public Schools students, they have access to Options for Knowledge and voluntary transfer programs.[23]

In 1990-91 controlled enrollment was used in 30 schools. In 25 of the schools it was used to reduce overcrowding, in three it was used to stabilize racial/ethnic balance and in two schools it was used for both overcrowding and racial/ethnic stabilization.[24] As of April 4, 1991, 2,522 students had to enroll in other than their neighborhood school due to controlled enrollment. Table 9, on the following page, shows that the great majority of

TABLE 9

Race/Ethnicity of Entering Students Affected by Controlled Enrollment 1990-1991

Racial/Ethnic Group	Number	Percent
Whites	322	12.7
Blacks	766	30.4
Hispanics	1,379	54.7
Other	55	2.2
Totals	2,522	100.0

students affected by controlled enrollment were racial/ethnic minorities. In fact, only 12.7 percent are white, while the 87.3 percent are non-white. Hispanic students are most likely

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., p. 158.

to attend a school outside of their own neighborhood because of controlled enrollment, with 54.7 percent of them doing so.

While the foregoing indicates the impact of controlled enrollment for new enrollments in 1990-91, Table 10 shows that the cumulative impact of such enrollments over

TABLE 10

Race/Ethnicity of all Students Affected by Controlled Enrollment 1990-1991

Racial/Ethnic Group	Number	Percent
Whites	1,455	13.0
Blacks	4,189	37.6
Hispanics	5,175	46.4
Other	334	3.0
Totals	11,153	100.0

the class years is even more dramatic. The total number for all grades of students enrolled in out-of-neighborhood schools during 1990-91 was 11,153. Table 10 shows again that the majority of such students are non-white. The great majority of the students are black, 37.6 percent, and Hispanic, 46.4 percent.[25] Whether such enrollments are viewed positively or negatively may be a matter of the school in which such controlled enrollments end up.

Table 11 provides some insight. White students, 45.8 percent, are most likely to end up in integrated/desegregated schools, with black students almost as likely, 41.7 percent.

---

[25] Ibid., p. 174.

TABLE 11[26]

Location of Controlled Enrollments
Type of School
1990-91

School Type	Racial/Ethnic Group								Total	
	White		Black		Hispanic		Other			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Int/Des	667	45.8	1,748	41.7	1,717	33.2	218	65.3	4,350	39.0
Magnet	519	35.7	484	11.6	811	15.7	96	28.7	1,910	17.1
Pre Min	125	8.6	753	18.0	1,448	28.0	9	2.7	2,335	20.9
Com Acad	78	5.4	558	13.3	463	8.9	2	0.6	1,101	9.9
Ovr crd*	66	4.5	646	15.4	736	14.2	9	2.7	1,457	13.1
Totals	1,455	100	4,189	100	5,175	100	334	100	11,153	100

* Schools designed to attract transfers including integrated/desegregated, predominantly minority, and racially identifiable schools.

However, Hispanic students, only 33.2 percent, are much less likely to do so. The next most likely location for whites, 35.7 percent, is in magnet schools, but only 11.6 percent of blacks and 15.7 percent of Hispanics go to magnet schools. Perhaps the largest difference is in the likelihood of Hispanic students, 28 percent ending up in predominantly minority schools, while 18 percent of black controlled enrollment students end up in such schools.

The general concern of the Commission is that controlled enrollment should not become an inadvertent vehicle for promoting segregation or lessening the likelihood that members of any racial/ethnic groups have more desirable enrollment sites available.

---

[26] Ibid., Table 11 is constructed from data shown on p. 174.

D. Participation of Unique Student Groups in Options for Knowledge Schools

The 1990-91 ADR Part I contains a description of the participation by former nonpublic students, free and reduced price lunch recipients, as well as special education students in various Options for Knowledge schools.[27] The Commission has long desired about this information. But, the reported data has inconsistencies. On page 215 of the ADR, it is reported that 32,478 students are enrolled in magnet schools, excluding kindergarten. On Pages 32 and 33 magnet schools are reported enrolling 18,744, including kindergarten. Some of the difference between the 32,478 and 18,744 is perhaps accounted for by an additional 8,825 students enrolled in magnet schools that do not have racial requirements. But, that still leaves 4,909 students unaccounted for. The discrepancy needs to be clarifed. A series of schools are listed from pages 215 through 218, but the text is not clear as to whether these are all magnet schools, how they are classified with respect to desegregation, or the number of students they enrolled. It would be helpful if all magnet schools were listed together and identified in terms of whether they covered under the Plan, and if so, how they are classified. The number and racial/ethnic composition of all such students would also be helpful.

Regardless, the Commission is encouraged that 1,478 former nonpublic students are enrolled in magnet schools and another 670 have joined community academies. However, the Commission requests similar information regarding students who leave magnet schools and community academies for nonpublic enrollment.[28]

---

[27] Ibid, p. 215 ff.

[28] Ibid, p. 215 and 218.

Likewise, the Commission is pleased that data was included on the student free and reduced price lunch recipient data. The list includes 28 of the 30 magnet schools in the integrated/desegregated group, three magnet schools with no racial requirements, and an additional five schools whose inclusion on the list as magnets is not clear. These five included Hawthorne, Owen, Thorp (a scholastic academy), Gunsaulus, and Stone.[29] The list is too extensive to be just elementary full-site magnets. The data also seem to imply that all students in the schools are receiving free or reduced price lunch. The Commission would find it useful to know the percentage of students transferring into schools under the Options for Knowledge Program who receive free and reduced price lunch benefits.

Last, the Commission appreciates the data on the enrollment of special education students in Options for Knowledge schools was included. However, the number of students reported as enrolled in magnet schools differs again from that originally reported on pages 32 and 33, 18,744, and from the 32,478 reported on page 215. On page 220, magnet schools are described as have 33,603 enrollments. The reader now has three quite different numbers to choose from: 18,744, 32,478, and 33,603. The Commission needs to know what is the actual enrollment in magnet schools, and categories of magnet schools are under discussion.

The report also fails to delineate how many of the special education recipients are enrolled in an Options for Knowledge Program because they reside in the school attendance area or have transferred into the school from some other attendance area. It is important to clarify and distinguish the two. In addition, special education students are listed as

---

[29] Ibid., p. 219.

"participating" in the Options for Knowledge Program. The Commission would like to know as to whether they were only participating in the program, or also attending special education programs. The two groups should be differentiated.

E. The Effects of the Plan on the Chicago Public Schools

Pages 249-259 of the 1990-91 ADR Part I presented DEEOP's perspective on the effects of the Plan on certain issues facing the Chicago Public schools including: effects on racial composition of schools, overcrowding, utilization of school facilities, student participation in multicultural, and the multiethnic and multiracial environment.

DEEOP concludes that 52 schools would be overcrowded and 138 schools would be underutilized without the benefit of the Plan.[30] It is also concluded that the Plan has reduced the number of white racially identifiable schools from 38 to nine.[31] Last, DEEOP states that:

> Students are provided an awareness of other racial and ethnic cultures that they might not otherwise experience, fostering an appreciation for cultural diversity and a recognition of the need for interracial cooperation, understanding and respect.

The Commission sees the Plan as a student assignment document that protects the rights of students and families, especially racial and ethnic minorities, from potential negative impacts from decisions of the Chicago Public schools. The Plan is also a document containing educational goals that if met would redress certain deficiencies that years of racial isolation have created among minority students.

---

[30] Ibid., pp. 250-251.

[31] Ibid., p. 250.

Without question, the Plan has had impacts on the Chicago Public Schools. There are many fewer white identifiable schools. School space problems could have occurred without the Plan, but giving families the right to choose a school when overcrowding is an issue is the result of the Plan. The potential to have schools that are multiethnic, multicultural, multiracial, as claimed by DEEOP above, is one of the primary motivations for desegregation.

F. Mandatory Backup Measures, Interdistrict Transfers and Within-School Segregation

The Commission endorses the mandatory boundary adjustments recommended for Bridge and Farnsworth schools as well as monitoring the status of all applications for transfer to schools with white enrollment between 30-35 percent.[32] The Commission also endorses the proposed 1991-92 implementation of the five recommendations for monitoring within school segregation.[33]

G. Financial Aspects of Implementing the Plan

The detailed information on the financing of the Plan is helpful.[34] Of particular interest to the Commission is the variation in dollars spent per pupil across the various racial/ethnic categories of schools under the Plan. Table 12, on the following page shows the discrepancies across the categories of schools.[35] The first column shows the percent

---

[32] Ibid., pp. 275-276.

[33] Ibid., p. 291.

[34] Ibid., pp. 292-320.

[35] Ibid., Table 12 data is based on information on p. 295.

TABLE 12

Expenditures by Category of School
1988-90

Category of School	Percent of Students	Percent of Expenditures	Expenditure Per Student
Stably Integrated	6.14	3.41	95.73
Stably Desegregated	10.32	10.14	169.15
Magnet	5.06	9.38	319.10
Scholastic Acad	.79	1.92	417.44
Metro High Schools	1.29	1.27	169.01
Predom Minority	9.60	6.10	109.28
Racially Identifiable	66.80	67.78	174.60
Total	100.00	100.00	n/a

of all Chicago Public School students. The second column shows percent of expenditures allocated to the category of school. Column three reports the dollars spent per student in the categories of schools.

Stably integrated schools show a negative discrepancy in that they have 6.14 percent of the students, but receive only 3.41 percent of the expenditures. Predominantly minority schools have a similar negative picture representing 9.6 percent of all students, but receiving only 6.10 percent of the budget allocations.

Schools having a positive discrepancy, that is, receiving a greater percentage than they represent, include magnet schools who had 5.06 percent of the students, but receive 9.38 percent of the allocations, and scholastic academies who have .79 percent of the students but receive 1.92 percent of the allocations. Three categories of schools, the stably

desegregated, metropolitan high schools, and racially identifiable schools receive allocations that are generally in keeping with the proportions of students they serve.

The difference in resource allocation is more dramatically displayed when presented in terms of dollars allocated for each student. If dollars were evenly distributed, $172.08 would be allocated for each student. Table 12 shows that students in some categories of schools receive far less than that, while others receive far more. Thus, students in stably integrated schools receive $95.73, and those in predominantly minority schools receive only $109.28. In contrast, students in magnet schools receive $319.10 while those in scholastic academies get $417.44. Students attending stably desegregated, metropolitan high schools, and racially identifiable schools receive allocations close to what the case would be with even distribution with $169.15, $169.01 and $174.60 respectively. The differences in allocations is striking.

Whatever the justifications forwarded for the differences in allocations, the Commission is disturbed by the implications of those differences. By virtue of the schools they end up in, Chicago Public School students have access to very different educational resources and likely have their educational futures shaped by the circumstance of the school they attend.

H. Recommended Implementation Strategies

In each ADR Part I, DEEOP details major policy amendments it plans to initiate in the following school year, and such is the case with 1990-91 ADR Part I. DEEOP has recommends the implementation of six strategies for 1991-92 for altering current procedures

associated with the student assignment aspects of the Plan. The Commission has a reaction to each of the strategies.

Implementation Strategy One: Modify the controlled enrollment policy so that once the membership in a controlled enrollment school is returned to design capacity, students residing in the attendance area, who have been longest in a school to which they have been redirected, may be enrolled in September, at the beginning of a school year.[36]

Commission Reaction: The Commission believes this a reasonable strategy once all parties concur that the membership of a school has stably declined below design capacity. The Commission offers the following observation. Students who have been attending a redirected school longest will also be older and in upper grades. Should only they, and not their siblings, be given the option of returning to their neighborhood school?

The Commission would requests that a more flexible policy be offered to families. It seems reasonable that many families, with younger children, would rather that they be allowed to attend school locally while older children stay at the school they have attended for some years. There may be other reasons for moving forward with a more flexible policy.

The Commission requests that DEEOP consider this and make their ruling such that, when choice is possible, families be allowed to choose which of their children return to the neighborhood school.

---

[36] Ibid., p. 321.

Implementation Strategy Two: Return students improperly enrolled, and whose voluntary transfer does not enhance the levels of desegregation at the receiving school, to their attendance area schools, or to a school where they will enhance desegregation.[37]

Commission Reaction: The Commission endorses the strategy, but does not believe that the concern should only be with improperly enrolled students who do not also enhance desegregation. Improper enrollments should be permitted. To do so, endorses the notion that families, regardless of race, need not follow the enrollment rules. Further, it penalizes families that comply with the application process and the Board's transfer policies under the Plan. DEEOP should rethink the implications of the proposed strategy.

Implementation Strategy Three: As required by the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools, implement mandatory backup measures to ensure compliance with the provision that each school achieve and maintain an enrollment of at least 30 percent minority.[38]

Commission Reaction: The Commission endorses the boundary changes of the Bridge and Farnsworth schools in an attempt to reach a minimum of 30 percent minority enrollment at these schools. The Commission is aware the boundary changes have been used before to relieve overcrowding and recognizes they are now needed to ensure appropriate racial balance. The Commission would find it desirable to achieve the 35

---

[37] Ibid., p. 322.

[38] Ibid., p. 323.

percent minimum of minority enrollment in much the same manner for schools not attaining the Board of Education standard.

Implementation Strategy Four: Change the magnet school status of Metcalfe to a community academy.[39]

Commission Reaction: The Commission endorses this strategy and is pleased to read that DEEOP involved the Metcalfe Local School Council in the decision.

Implementation Strategy Five: Revise the policy regarding graduating students enrolled on voluntary transfers in feeder elementary schools.[40]

Commission Reaction: The Commission cannot endorse this strategy at this time. The Commission does not feel it reasonable to give these students priority over others when seeking to enroll in a outside high school via a voluntary transfer and then never asking them to apply again to gain access to a high school. This limits the opportunities of others. There are thousands of families, especially black families, whose children are not selected in a lottery for voluntary transfer to an integrated or desegregated elementary school. The proposed strategy would further limit their chances for gaining lottery admission to an integrated or desegregated high school because of the priority given to the admission of voluntary transfers graduating from feeder elementary schools. The Commission does not perceive the strategy as prudent. It amounts to telling families that even if their children

---

[39] Ibid.

[40] Ibid., p. 324.

are selected to attend a preferred high school through a lottery, they may not be admitted because the space has been usurped by voluntary transfers.

Implementation Strategy Six: In keeping with the requirement of the Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools: Recommendations of Educational Components to address minority students' educational needs through equity of available programs, establish George Gershwin Elementary School as a Mathematics and Science Community Academy.[41]

Commission Reaction: The Commission concurs with the strategy but would like to be assured that, as in the case of Metcalfe, that the Gershwin Local School Council has been involved in the decision.

V. CONCLUSION

The Commission has responded to the 1990-91 ADR Part I. This response highlights several student assignment issues and related concerns that the Commission believes are most pertinent to the continued implementation of the Plan.

---

[41] Ibid., p. 325.